

## REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner's reconsideration of the present application.

### Summary of Office Action

Claims 1-20 are pending.

The drawings were objected to.

Claims 1-3, 5-7, 9-10, 12, 15-16, and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,274,702 of Rosch, et al. ("Rosch") in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,151,482 of Robe ("Robe").

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 8, 9, 11, 15, and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Rosch in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,284,958 of Pryor, et al. ("Pryor").

Claims 13, 14, 19, and 20 were indicated as being allowable if re-written.

### Summary of Amendments

Claims 1, 5, 9, and 15 have been amended. Claims 2, 4, 8, 11, and 17 have been canceled. Applicant submits that neither the claim amendments nor the claim cancellations add new matter.

### Response to Objection to the Drawings

The drawings were objected to for not showing "the field effect transistors" of claims 4, 8, 11, and 17. (02/09/2006 Office Action, p. 2). Applicant canceled claims 4, 8, 11, and 17. Applicant submits that the objections to the drawings have been overcome.

### Response to 35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejections

Claims 1-12, 15-16, and 19-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over various combinations of Rosch, Robe, and Pryor. As noted

above, claims 4, 8, 11, and 17 were cancelled such that claims 1-3, 5-7, 9-10, 12-16, and 17-20 are pending.

Given that the Examiner has not previously recognized the “d.c. isolation” language of the independent claims as contributing to patentability and that the undersigned inadvertently confused “isolation” with “independence” when distinguishing the references, applicant has removed such language from the independent claims. Additional claim amendments have been made.

Applicant submits claims 1-3, 5-7, 9-10, 12-16, and 17-20, as amended, are patentable over the cited references. In particular, none of the references, alone or combined, teaches or suggests *i) coupling the audio signal to the subscriber line through a plurality of transistors coupled in a common base configuration, and ii) receiving linefeed driver control signals for controlling battery feed to the subscriber line, wherein the audio signal and the linefeed driver control signals are received as currents on the same signal lines.*

Rosch’s amplifiers are clearly voltage amplifiers. The linefeed “control” and the audio signal are received as *voltages* that are applied to *voltage* amplifiers. Rosch does not teach or suggest the use of common base transistor amplifier stages for 132, 134. Moreover, since Rosch teaches unity or greater gain for 132, 134 (Rosch, col. 10, lines 30-38), applicant submits that Rosch teaches away from the use of common base transistor amplifier stages since such configurations provide less than unity gain.

Pryor and Robe include disclosures of a common base amplifier stage, however, such circuitry is integral to overall voltage amplifier circuitry. (Robe, col. 2, lines 29-55; Figs. 1-4)(Pryor, col. 1, lines 13-28)

None of the cited references, alone or combined, teaches receiving either the linefeed driver control signals or the audio signal as *currents*.

Thus none of the references, alone or combined, teaches or suggests *i) coupling the audio signal to the subscriber line through a plurality of transistors coupled in a common base configuration, and ii) receiving linefeed driver control signals for controlling battery feed to the subscriber line, wherein the audio signal and the linefeed driver control signals are received as currents on the same signal lines.*

In contrast, amended claim 1 includes the language:

1. A method comprising the steps of:
  - a) receiving an outgoing audio signal; and
  - b) *coupling the audio signal to a subscriber line through a plurality of transistors coupled in a common base configuration; and*
  - c) *receiving linefeed driver control signals for controlling battery feed to the subscriber line, wherein the audio signal and the linefeed driver control signals are received as currents on the same signal lines.*

(Claim 1, as amended)(*emphasis added*)

Similar arguments may be made with respect to amended claims 5, 9, and 15 which include the language:

5. A method comprising the steps of:
  - a) *receiving linefeed driver control signals and outgoing audio signals as currents on a same plurality of signal lines; and*
  - b) *providing the outgoing audio signals to a subscriber line through a common base isolation stage.*

(Claim 5, as amended)(*emphasis added*)

9. A subscriber line interface circuit apparatus, comprising:
  - a first circuit for coupling a received outgoing audio signal to a subscriber line, *wherein the first circuit couples the received outgoing audio signal to the subscriber line through a common base isolation stage, wherein the first circuit controls battery feed to the subscriber line in accordance with received linefeed driver control signals, wherein the linefeed driver control signals and the outgoing audio signal are received as currents on the same signal lines.*

(Claim 9, as amended)(*emphasis added*)

15. A subscriber line interface circuit apparatus, comprising:
  - a signal processor providing an outgoing audio signal; and
  - a linefeed driver coupled to receive the outgoing audio signal and at least one linefeed driver control signal as currents on the same signal line, wherein the linefeed driver couples the received outgoing audio signal to a subscriber line through a common base isolation stage, wherein the linefeed driver provides battery feed to the subscriber line in accordance with the linefeed driver control signal.*

(Claim 15, as amended)(*emphasis added*)

Thus applicant submits claims 1, 5, 9, and 15 are patentable over the cited references under 35 U.S.C. § 103. Given that claim 3 depends from claim 1; claims 6-7 depend from claim 5; claims 10, 12-14 depend from claim 9; and claims 16, and 18-20 depend from claim 15, applicant submits claims 3, 6-7, 10, 12-14, 16, and 18-20 are likewise patentable over the cited references.

Applicant respectfully submits the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103 have been overcome.

### **Conclusion**

In view of the amendments and arguments presented above, applicant respectfully submits the applicable objections and rejections have been overcome. Therefore all of claims 1, 3, 5-7, 9-10, 12-16, and 17-20 as amended should be found to be in condition for allowance.

If there are any issues that can be resolved by telephone conference, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at **(512) 858-9910**.

Respectfully submitted,

Date July 10, 2006

William D. Davis  
William D. Davis  
Reg No. 38,428